

GANDHI vs. LENIN

BY

S. A. DANGE.

"We shall not give the Govt. assistance to collect revenue. We shall not assist them in carrying on the administration of justice. We shall have our own courts and if time comes, we shall not pay taxes."

Lok. B. G. TILAK.

in 1906.



MY OWN FOREWORD.

Every book must have a preface or a foreword; and that preface must be from a well-known writer or a 'leader' standing high in public-favour. These are the first principles of publishing a book in our lays. If we analyse prefaces to publications of our times, they fall into the following classes: The preface (1) containing a eulogy of the writer's abilities to write on the particular subject in hand and pleading the necessity of such a book on that particular subject, (2) containing a summary of the subject-matter of the publication and one or two paltry suggestions, (3) containing an impartial judgement on the book by a man, who knows the subject very well and showing the discrepancies, if any. A good book with the 3rd kind of preface is a rarity now-a-days. Hack-writers, wishing to sell cheap, far and wide meet us at every book-stall with glaring placards, mentioning with great care the name of the preface or foreword-writer, who in ninety cases out of hundred is some demagogue assuming the airs of a patriot-leader in the politics of the day. The public seldom knows the troubles the poor writer has to undergo, to procure for their benefit, a foreword from some 'great leader', with the key or stamp of whose name, he wishes to enter the regions of public favour. He has to introduce himself through several other less great leaders satellites of the centre planet.

The 'Big Boy' sometimes does not even know that his person is so well guarded by his faithful 'crooks'. After introduction the poor preface-procurer has to flatter the 'great leader,' saying in the usual line, that he is the only one, capable of giving any opinion on the subject and that the public would like to hear his views and that etc., etc. Then the 'great leader,' all smiles, condescends to go through the book once. For some days, the poor writer waits dreaming that the book is being gone through. He returns to hear that on account of pressure of work, (of course public work because a 'leader' has no time to visit the race-courses and the

speculation bazzars, at least openly,) he could not find time.* But he would be glad to do it very soon. If the writer relying upon the words of that honest man has advertised the time, when the work was to be out, he has to express his regret that on account of 'unforeseen circumstances the publication was delayed.' After all these troubles of coming and going to the 'great leader's' house, sending in visiting cards, (for even in a leader's house, men must not enter without sending in their names, like a Hindoo! Lok. Tilak was not a 'well-bred leader' for peasants could go and speak to him without 'announcing' themselves!) the public gets some lessons in patriotism, the new spirit in the nation, their birthrights and fighting the battle of liberty to death and so on. [Now-a-days every writer must mention at least once the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs!] The readers dazzled by the strong wording and high notions, never dream that the whole thing, over the signature of the great man that they are reading, has been written, not by himself, but by his learned private secretary, specially paid and maintained for this purpose!¹ By this I do not mean that all publications are such. What I mean is simply this, that if a foreword is to be a mere eulogy of the author or a summary of the subject-matter to follow, it is better that the book should be without any foreword, because the reader can very well know both the writer and the summary, after reading the book himself. However a novice in the line of writing has to suffer these hardships. Let us remember that Johnson suffered much more before he became Dr. Johnson!

Now I will begin my own true foreword. I thought of writing this booklet, when at the beginning of the N. C. O. movement our

⁰ I know of a well-known professor, a Marathi scholar, who could not find time to write a preface, until he or rather the time was paid for it!

¹ Many capitalists and money-leaders of Bombay have their speeches, written by their private secretaries, who are sometimes bar-at-laws, and deliver them in currency committees and industrial conferences!

opponents began to discredit it, by pretending to find signs of Bolshevik activity in the movement and thus kill it. The public knew very little of the Bolsheviks beyond some fables, created by news-paper booming. Seeing this I thought of writing this booklet, to show the extreme contrast between the methods of N. C. O. activity and the Bolshevik plan, to accomplish their ideals. There is not much literature, available for such a work, on the Russian Revolution and the Bolsheviks; because our Government takes great care to guard the gates of India against the entry of authentic literature on the subject. What has been allowed to enter, is written by men, who hate the Bolsheviks and are of imperialistic tendencies. In such a situation, it is difficult to write with confidence on the subject. However my purpose will be served, if the booklet gives at least an idea of the elementary principles of the great movement in Russia and of the hypocrisy of those, who would class N. C. O. with Bolshevism, if my countrymen come to recognize the magnitude of extremism to which we will have to go in our struggle for emancipation and to expect and be ready for Government Terrorism, a veritable greater Ireland on the Indian soil !

My foreword is finished. I am sorry, at the end I cannot add the author's script to mention and thank some kind friend for having read and corrected the proofs of my book, as is the custom; for I myself had to do the work !!

BOMBAY,
April 1921. }

S. A. DANGE.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
Public.Resource.Org

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
MY OWN FOREWORD	I
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTORY	1
II SOCIETY OF TO-DAY : THE CLASS WAR	13
III GANDHI VS. LENIN	23
IV "THE ARMED BLOW"	40
V THE INDIAN REVOLUTION	52
APPENDIX A. ... *	62
„ B.	63
„ C.	64

CHAPTER I.

Introductory.

"The Earth is of God and it cannot be accursed."

Mazzini.

Aquisitiveness, vanity, rivalry and love of power ! When the great massive genius of the Macedonian Conqueror lay silent in Babylon, perhaps Aristotle in his philosophic mood might have murmured, "Aquisitiveness vanity, rivalry and love of power, what wert thou, but a mixture of these, that now thou dost thus lie there in dust!" When the dormant fire in the huts on the Arab sands blazed into flames, what else but these moved them to put the unbelievers to sabres. The Golden Rule of Haroun-al-Rashjid or the days of devastation by the nomadic hordes of flying Zenghiz Khan were ruled by these and these only. Nothing but the volcanic irruptions of these seething elements in the human mind fill the most interesting and busy periods of History. Discord in the harmonious rule of the world is the headline of History. Peoples of the world possessed no written history so long as there was harmony. The day when they did the first thing that could be written as history, was the day of the irruption of these elements, a day of discord in the House of God !

Monarchy, Aristocracy, Democracy are the symbolic measurements that read to you the gradual extension of the Kingdom of these Imperial Majesties - aquisitiveness, vanity, rivalry and love of power. When their kingdom extended only over one master-mind in a nation, there was Monarchy. When many, many such master-minds became participators in the rule of tyranny and came under the sway of these fascinating, skin-beautiful hydra-heads of the disfigured sides of human mind, there was Aristocracy. And last of all, when a sufficiently large number became bondsmen

to these governing instruments of crime, a number sufficient to drown the voice of God within man, by its cheers of joy for the attainment of what they thought to be the heavenly form of life, under the sun and beyond the sun, it was called the advent of Democracy. So,

Monarchy : All not-freemen except one.

Aristocracy : Most not-freemen except a few.

Democracy : Majority not-freemen except a powerful minority. Such was and such is the position of the contending masses in their struggle towards the realization of the ideal of mutual association and unhampered life of individuals. As long as oppression was centred in one head and one hand—as long as there was Monarchy—the struggle for emancipation was not a hard one, which is clearly exemplified by the comparative ease, with which even mighty monarchies were overthrown in the ancient past. But as soon as the ranks of oppression began to be recruited from the proud intellectuals and the so-called chosen of the people, as monarchy became seconded actively by aristocracy, the struggle for emancipation became still more hard. The common citizen, looking with hatred and awe to the palacial manors of the chosen grinders of the people and ground down under the systems of forced labour¹ and taxation² for the benefit of the upper or heavenly, head-born³ classes, whether in India or in Europe, lost all faith in himself and came to consider himself to be born for nothing but labour, fruitless for himself, fruitful for his chosen grinders. The individual was reduced to the state even below that of a hunting-beast, so much so that once in France there existed a law authorizing

1. In France and Veth in India. 2. The Aristocrats were exempted from taxation in France and the Ministry of Turgot and Necker failed because they advocated taxation for all without exception. It was one of the causes that led to the Rev. in 1789. 3. The Brahmanical class.

a Seigneur, as he returned from hunting, to kill not more than two Serfs and refresh his feet in their warm blood and bowels¹. From slaves of the monarchs to serfs of the seigneurs or the chosen higher, in the icy zones of Europe, men's faith in the higher law and higher ideals, became chilled, while the hot imaginative mind of the Indian under the sun, losing all hope in the present matter-of-fact life, became resigned and pessimistic and sat, with eyes turned towards heaven, considering salvation in death or in the rejection of worldly life². Until at last it took the whole life of Luther, Rousseau and Voltaire, to teach man to consider himself as man, to reveal to the famished individual that he was the sovereign of his destiny and of his life. "They recovered to humanity its lost little-deeds." This was a revelation of good as well as evil. The individual was sovereign! Ah! Then why shall he not conquer and be free! Monarchies with their gilded thrones, and Aristocracies with their chateaus built of the hunger and curses of the poor, tumbled down. The individual was free and was sovereign! But it was the beginning of evil too: Possessing no ideal but the negation of a lie, negation of subjection to the chosen few, and not being given side by side, the ideal of subjection to the Higher Law of God, to life of common good and association, the individual strove only to suppress the lie! But when it was suppressed, what remained? The whole daemonic nature of man remained,—hurled forth to rage blindly without rule or rein; savage itself, yet with all the tools and weapons of civilization: a spectacle new in History³. The individual thinking only of his rights and never of duties, substituted himself in the place of those, whom he had overthrown, with the difference that where there were the chosen few, there came the many from the common file, but still participators in the continuation of the same criminal rule of oppression. As the ranks of

1. Carlyle's Fr. Rev. 2. Especially the school of Sanyasism in Hindu Philosophy and the school of Hinayanas in Buddhism.
3. Carlyle's Fr. Rev.

oppression began to be filled from the oppressed themselves, the struggle became still more hard and bitter. Under Democracy people found that they themselves being participators, were oppressors of themselves. The nobles, Sirdars and aristocrats of the old order, were followed in the new one by capitalists and entrepreneurs. Liberty for the individual was recognized a little but liberty for other nations was denied. Whole nationalities began to subject others to slavery.

The initiation of the second stage of emancipation of the individual from the rule of the privileged or the rise of individualism in Europe began with the French Revolution. The very heart and centre of the rights of man suffered from ebb and flow, on account of the vile plotters of authority, who read their doom in the new age. Metternich and his associates stemmed the tide of the consciousness of the individual, for some time, until at last came the year 1848, the year of revolutions and constitutions, after which people saw many from amongst themselves in the high throne of democracy. It seemed as if the days of tyranny were over, thanks to the French Revolution and the all-levelling campaigns of the Corsican conqueror. The peoples dined over the constitutions and democracy waved the banners. They thought themselves happy and free and forgot the pains that slavery inflicts on man and newly thought of conquests, of putting others in slavery. They had been taught "everyone for himself," "here on earth and nowhere else." With such doctrines, digested and turned into flesh and blood of their life, their ideal of life became "acquisitiveness, vanity rivalry and love of power." History had begun with these Crooked Four. And after centuries of toil and blood-flow of martyrs, what was the result, what change? The result and change was that the executive power in the dominion of these Crooked Four was transferred from monarchs and aristocrat-slave-owners into the hands of many of the slaves themselves, who exulting in the change of hands, became seargeants of these devilish elements in their turn.

As such in their zeal they turned for conquests and conquered India, Africa, Persia and others principalities of the East. But we are chiefly concerned with India and its evolution under these newly emancipated slaves and slaveowners of the civilized order.

India with her water-tight compartments of the divisions of her peoples into classes, had evolved a philosophy and an Indian mind, which had fully realized and imbibed the principles of that philosophy. And this philosophy was specially and thoroughly efficient to maintain and promote the spirit of that particular form of social division. It was nothing but the Hindu philosophy and view of life that had maintained the class divisions of India, in their origin designed to maintain and facilitate a division of social labour¹, but in later stages becoming obsolete and oppressive.

The doctrine in Hindu philosophy, that the whole development of the human race and course of events was pre-arranged by God and the individual was nothing but an instrument, in the fulfilment, in the practical realization of this pre-arranged plan of the universe, made the individual a firm believer in the doctrine of fatalism. This led Indians to find the cause of every calamity, of every good as well as evil, of every injustice, in their preordained destiny, before which they thought their potent energies to be powerless to achieve anything, which apparently seemed to be against the mysterious settled course of events. And they judged of this opposition of events or their favourableness not from any plausible causes but from omens, from predictions of astrologers, mahants and fakirs. Such methods abound in societies, where individuals, having lost faith in their subjective energies seek revelation of the predestined course in objective signs and utterances. Another principle, a necessary corollary to the first was that of contentment. Since the individual was unable to change or undo anything, as everything that was, was there according to an already settled plan, what was the use of struggle? In contentment they must live,

¹ Mr. B. G. Tilak on caste system in India.

in submission to the lot that had fallen to them according to their destiny. The natural result was that men became inactive, less struggling and less persevering¹. And moreover this habit of mind was helped by the comparative easiness, with which, Nature yielded to the Indians, the necessities of life. The Indians formed a character of accepting the existing order of the day without demur and of submitting to the miseries, that arose from the obsolete and oppressive forms of the social order, in which they found themselves born. In full accordance with the principle of contentment and the pessimistic view of life, they were never interested in the pursuits of gaining mastership over the forces of Nature, to add to the ease of life by inventions or explorations or exploitations, unless it became absolutely necessary for a decent upkeep of life. For all these virtues (!) the Europeans naturally compliment us, since it is to their advantage and necessary for their existence in India, for these virtues of living on few necessities of life, of law-abiding nature, of aversion to rapid and radical changes or revolutions. Perhaps these very virtues have become at this stage in Indian politics very much detrimental to our own interests !

In spite of all this, what saved the Indians from the deteriorating and pernicious effects of such doctrines was their extreme faith in God and Religion. Only that marvellous faith, the most distinguishing feature of the Indian character, saved them from the complete extinction of their race or decay from within due to immobility.

And Indian History shows that if ever there have been great struggles, they have been for that faith and that Religion, which the Indians cherish. If ever true Hindu States of the people have been built by the people and not by ambitious monarchs, they have been built, for the protection, preservation and promul-

¹ The Sanskrit proverb that the Dakshinatyas are enthusiastic at the beginning, well illustrates this view.

gation of that faith and Religion. The Buddhist Empires and the Maratha Revolution clearly testify to that.

Such principles made the Indians indifferent to the miseries of the social order, which sometimes became so oppressive that great minds had to overthrow or modify them as in the days of Jnaneshwar or Tukaram. However the character of divinity, created behind these divisions,¹ and often misunderstood in the real sense, supported them and the serfdom or the bondage to the higher classes continued to grow in India, while the same was being destroyed in the European world. So it was that when the aggressive spirit of Europe began to extend its activities, it found easy matter for subjugation in India. The struggle for conquests was between the acquisitive spirit of the Whites and the governing powers of the Indian principalities. The masses in India were immersed in themselves and never thought of the foreigner. They had seen many such coming and going, guests for a while.

But the new guest showed no signs of ceasing to be a guest, with the dinner of spoils he had received, as others had done. But when the economic drain, the grinding of the new master began to pinch the stomachs of the masses, they began to search for the cause. But instead of finding and striking at the root of the evil, they retired into themselves and still more cut down their necessities, murmuring that it was God's will and that it was their fate that was to be blamed !

But it was now time for the masses of India to awaken to the new spirit, that was coming from the Whites of Europe, and either to assimilate it or reject it and give it a death-blow. But the Indians, with their want of faith in their power, without subjective consciousness, were unable to do anything of this kind. And as Rousseau and Voltaire were required to spend a whole life in teaching the individual his rights to freedom and sovereignty,

1 Geeta.

to make the individual conscious of his latent powers, so the whole life of the great genius of Tilak was required to make the Indians feel that they had a right to individual freedom as everybody else had and that it was their sacred right and duty to fight for the accomplishment of that freedom.

With the advent of the European conquerors in the land and the subsequent permanence of their rule, the system of jurisprudence introduced by the new rulers possessed much of the spirit of the European systems, though through thoughtfulness and as a measure of policy much of the necessary character of the old systems of law prevalent in the customs of the people, was retained by the new rulers. Yet the vast change was that the divisions of the social whole into classes possessed no credit with the rulers, who naturally disregarded them in the promulgation of law. The principle of these immemorial divisions lost its sanction and support of the temporal power, though they continued to exist on the support of the so-called religious sanction and the habitual obedience of the people.

The new foreigners could not claim to be more civilized than their conquered subjects, if civilization meant refined virtues and character and mental qualities of high order. The only thing, in which they could claim superiority, was their mastery over the forces of Nature, their artful and ingenious science of mechanism: Evidently the people showed no love or loyalty of that nature, which the Marathas of the type of Jadhaves showed towards the Moghuls. These white foreigners had come to exploit the country for the aggrandisement of the personal interests of the members of their race and the collective interests of their nationalities, Naturally they fostered a system of education designed to turn out, generation after generation, men with a spirit that considered itself always subservient to that of the foreigners, men who found themselves vastly separated from the masses of their countrymen, in Sentiments and in character. This cleavage bet-

ween the intellectuals and the masses was to the advantage of the rulers, who found in the intellectuals obedient servants to them, helping and supporting their tyrannical, life-sucking system of government. This was the greatest danger that India had to face at the end of the 18th century. A peasantry that numbered 80% of the population, wringing its hands on account of scarcity due to the wealth-drain caused by an ingenious system of taxation and a class of intellectuals, who, only, in any country, can lead the masses and show them the roots of evil, estranged from the masses, a class of intellectuals unable to understand their sentiments and character ; thus was the dangerous situation of India, when the Genius of Tilak began to work to stem the tide of the increasing evil.

With an all-comprehensive genius, a true hero in the Carlylian sense, he started the campaign of speaking boldly and vigourously, of criticizing the iron rule of tyranny, and of claiming it as his right to speak out what he thought and to speak it direct. He suffered the consequences of this. But his suffering was necessary to shake the masses from their somnambulism ; and he was successful. It set them thinking, which revealed to them the source of all their trouble. They followed their saviour implicitly. He became a joining link between the intellectuals and the masses. Through him the intellectuals came to realize their duty and to lead the masses and love them. The yawning cleavage was filled up. He taught the masses their individual rights to freedom, to free speech, to be left alone in their land and not to be exploited for the sake of foreigners. His efforts made India conscious of the outside world and brought her in level with the ideas, that were governing the forces in the new world. But India's faith in the higher Law and Religion was not corrupted by the new ideas of individual rights, as was the case with the nations of Europe. This very fundamental characteristic raised the fighting Genius of Tilak to the high pedestal of divinity itself.

Thus the Tilak period was one of consciousness of rights. And History shows that such consciousness walks hand in hand with a simple and sincere demand of constitutions. France demanded constitution of Louis XVI, who gave it but it "would not walk". Italy demanded it of Prince Albert, Russia demanded it of the Czar and got the worthless Duma. Hungary did the same and got the blow of Metternich. So almost everywhere in the earlier stages of assertion of rights, constitution—fighting has been the first step. And History also shows that at the appearance of this step repression has been the resort of tyrants. Such typical scenes as happened in France can be met with in the history of every people fighting for liberty. "Dreary, languid do these (masses) struggle in their obscure remoteness, their health cheerless, their diet thin. For them in this world rises no era of hope; hardly now in the other,—if it be not hope in the gloomy rest of Death for their faith too is failing. Untaught, uncomfited, unfed! A dumb generation; their voice only an inarticulate cry; spokesman in the King's Council, in the world's forum they have none that finds credence. At rare intervals they will fling down their hoes and hammers and to the astonishment of thinking mankind, flock hither and thither, dangerous aimless, get the length even of Versailles, Turgot is altering the corn-trades, abrogating the absurdest corn laws; there is dearth real or were it even 'fictitious,' an indubitable scarcity of bread. And so on the 2nd of May 1775 these waste multitudes do here at Versailles Château in widespread wretchedness in sallow faces, squalor, winged raggedness, present, as in legible hieroglyphic writing, their Petition of Grievances. The Château gates must be shut, but the King will appear on the balcony and speak to them, they have seen the King's face; their Petition of Grievances has been,

if not read, looked at. For answer, two of them are hanged on a new gallows forty feet high and the rest are driven back to their dens for a time ! ”

The people going to the bureaucrat's palace in the capital Delhi in the April days of 1917 and the answer of guns to them—certainly a better and speedy remedy than a new gallows forty feet high—and the exploits of Dyrisim in the Punjab are the best reproductions of the French scenes, and the necessary accompaniment to constitution-fighting. Without such scenes excitement and subsequent progress are impossible.

Besides this the Tilak-period had produced another great thing. The leader of the peoples had also his treasure of independent philosophy. By his life and his masterly treatise on the Geeta, he put before the people, with an authority which he alone possessed, a new conception of man's actions. He saw the dangers arising from the pessimistic philosophy and he changed the vision. The people of India are always in a mood to accept anything that came from a religious source. Geeta was the only source, through which any body could speak to the people. With forty years of study and experience of action according to the Geeta, he revealed to the world and to India in particular, the underlying principle of continuous Karma, without egoistic covetousness for the fruits of it, continuous Karma for the realization of divinity in man. By his living example he taught to the Indians their duty of dedicating life to the service of Humanity without egoism. The people, who had been fed over doctrines of inaction or Sadhuism, gradually changed their vision and believed him. Most important of all was this conquest, of destroying the people's pessimism and making them

hopeful about the future, in struggle, while serving humanity. The Tilak-Period of Rights" taught the Indians, "The Earth is of God and it cannot be accursed."

India is modernized. That is what we Indians are to-day. Upon modern India of Tilak, a Mahatma is making his experiments of new methods of winning liberty. The modern systems of fight initiated by Tilak are suspended, and the quite new methods of Tolstoyan school are being tried to win freedom. History is repeating itself. Struggle is followed by repression, repression is mostly followed by success of the people. Now martyrdom is weltering in blood. But in this land of the Buddhas, the tree of Liberty shall not be watered by the blood of despots. How long, Oh ! Lord !

CHAPTER II.

Society of To-day : The Class War.

We have seen that the peoples of many nations left behind them the stage of individual bondage to the higher and privileged classes and the rise of Individualism was the product of the struggle. We saw India modernised in the Tilak period in the first twenty years, of the twentieth century and we now find ourselves struggling to overthrow the foreign Yoke, as the first result of the appearance of Individualism amongst us.

We said India is modernized. And we further say that in it lies her life as well as her death. How ?

The modernization of India is being carried directly on the European lines of progress. Naturally if the progress of events in Europe results in the happiness and well-being of that people the same type of progress perhaps may result in the happiness and well-being of our people too. And if it causes misery and death to them, it will do so in our land also. We say perhaps because the civilization of one people, may not cause the well-being of another too, as it happened to the original natives of America and Australia, to whom the coming of the civilization of the Whites was a signal for the destruction of their races, though in some cases, the destruction was brought about by a well-planned scheme of extermination, and not by the introduction of the new civilization. But what causes misery and death to a number of human beings in one place causes misery and death to another set of human beings in another place, if exceptional circumstances are left aside. A race of Escimos from the polar regions would not flourish happily in the Indian climate as one of Negroes or Chinese would ; but a number of human beings made to live in dense-packed cities and filthy houses, would certainly suffer from

their pernicious effect, whether they be Escimos, Indians or Chinese. The simple reason for all this seems to be that the forces of destruction and death work more uniformly than the forces of development and culture. So we will try to see what this new progress means to Europe and to us, whether it means life or death to Europe and life or death to us also.

Side by side with the work of emancipation of the common people from oppression, an industrial revolution took place in Europe, with which every student of history is quite familiar. This industrial revolution introduced the age of mechanism of our days. The whole course and standard of life of all communities, in which this revolution appeared, underwent vast radical changes. The old science of economics—though practically there was no such complicated science as now exists,—would not serve the purposes of the new social order that was ushered in by the revolution. Machinery-inventions made large scale production an easy possibility. But this large scale production, of course, necessitated large investments in machinery plantations, which brought into existence a class of men, who could make such investments, the class of capitalists. Mechanical production and output far superseded that of the home industries and village or guild-industries of the Medieval Ages. The ruin of these industries threw the old independent guild-labour-hands out of employment and thus brought them to the feet of the capitalists, who could propose their own terms to the labourers. The labourers could do nothing but offer themselves to these new masters on their conditions. This age of mechanism brought two changes in the life of the people. Machinery plantations could employ, at one and the same time and place large numbers of labourers. The seats of such plantations became overflowed with population, chiefly composed of the labouring masses. The worsted condition of these masses on account of want of education as well as want of money and facilities for development made such city-life still worse. Labour hands that before lived in their villages, lost

all their independence, the healthy condition of surroundings and the moral environments of open village life. On the other hand, the possibility to carry on unlimited production through machinery in a very short time, gave to the capitalists means of making vast profits, which intensified the feelings of acquisitiveness, vanity, rivalry and love of power. This made them disregard the condition of the labourers, that they employed and whom in course of time they began to consider as another piece of machinery. The old lords, serfs and slaves were abolished; but new kinds of lords and Slaves came into existence, without those obnoxious titles, under the name of capitalists and wage-earners. Monarchs waging wars for personal interests and whims, in the name of patriotism, ceased to exist. But a new monarchical class, that of capitalists, with their various titles of 'Silver-Kings' and 'Copper Kings,' with their executives of speculators, commission agents, exporters and importers, began to drag nations into wars, wars for their capitalistic interests, for capturing markets and countries to sell their goods. They worked out the labourers for hours like lifeless machines, produced vast quantities for the people of other nations and in order that this surplus product be sold, they made wars. But why all this trouble? Why should the Manchester capitalist try to clothe the whole of India, who can, and who could, if left alone, do without this philanthropy of these new slave-owners? Why could they not be content with clothing their own men abundantly and cheaply? And after all this competition and wars, who were to be benefitted and happy? The labourers, who had toiled and suffered hardships? No! Not at all! The whole wealth, thus obtained by starving the labourers at home and ruining labourers abroad, through competition, went to satisfy the lust of the capitalists. The labourers were men as much as the capital-owners were, but these monsters had their lusts to be satisfied, had vain ambitions of being called men of millions. These monster-heads began to corner the wealth and land of the world, while the labouring masses suffered of want

and hunger. Political parties and state mechanisms with their sham of democratic representations were dominated by their purses. Thus becoming masters of the political wheel, which alone is competent to effect reform in society, they could suppress the cry of lessening the miseries of the working-class.

Thus society of our times has come to be divided into three classes ; "The capitalists that is the possessors of the means and implements of labour, namely lands, factories, ready money and raw material ; contractors that is the heads and initiators of labour, commercial men, who represent or ought to represent intellect and the working men, who represent manual labour." The capitalists have become the masters of the new slaves, who are not given the rights of human beings even. "Time for education, intellectual development, for the fulfilling of social functions and for social intercourse, for the free play of his bodily and mental activity—moonshine ! But in its blind unrestrainable passion, its werewolf hunger for surplus labour, Capital oversteps not only the moral but even the merely physical maximum bounds of the working day. It usurps the time for growth, development and healthy maintenance of the body. It higgles over a meal-time, incorporating it, where possible, with the process of production itself, so that food is given to the labourer as to a mere means of production as coal is supplied to the boiler, grease and oil to the machinery. It reduces the sound sleep needed for the restoration, reparation, refreshment of bodily power to just so many hours of torpor, as the revival of an organism, absolutely exhausted renders essential. It is not the normal maintenance of the labour, which is to determine the limit of working day ; it is the greatest possible daily expenditure of labour power, no matter how diseased, compulsory and painful it may be, which is to determine the labourer's period of repose. Capital cares nothing for the length of life of labour power. All that concerns it is simply and solely the maximum of labour power that can be

rendered fluent in a working day. It attains this end by shortening the extent of the labourer's life as a greedy farmer snatches increased produce from the soil by robbing it of its fertility. Capital extends the labourer's time of production during a given period by shortening his actual life time."¹

Such intensity of the evil of the new system has generated a bitter hatred of the working classes towards the capitalists. To wrest from them more wages, shorter hours of work, strikes have become the order of the day. But such puissant methods do not move the capitalists, since in days of dearth of work, they being well-to-do and well-fed can afford to wait, while the poor labourer living in a hand-to-mouth condition has to yield and submit to worse conditions.

Such is the course of events in Europe, where society is daily faced with the problem of capital and labour, and the thoughtful of that community are scratching their heads to solve the problem.

We have seen India modernised and her industrialization is vehemently urged and carried on. Naturally her industrialization will be accomplished and is being accomplished on the lines of European systems. When this is done, surely, all the evils of European industrialism, all the methods of class-war between capitalism and labour, will rear their breeding here in our Society too.

Our country at present is suffering from the greatest danger of being impoverished to the last farthing and the last grain of corn by the avidity of European capitalists, assisted from within by our own men, and helped in their devilish designs by an oppressive foreign government. The impoverishment is being carried on quite methodically and constitutionally, which in the case of private persons would have amounted to ingenious robbery and homicide, not amounting to murder, by processes of slow starvation. The 200 millions of our peasantry are reduced to a level of want and

¹ Karl Marx: Capital I P. 249

suffering by heavy taxes, which are squandered in paying foreign military contingents,¹ maintained for the so-called defence of the country from the frontier tribes, who perhaps never think of India, but really maintained to shoot down patriotism² and in pensioning monstrous crops of European civilians, who are the worst possible lot in the whole governing system, and who turn traitorous to the interests of India, after grazing abundantly, with their kith and kin on her golden-pasture-lands, as soon as they leave her shores³. Another method of impoverishing is the continuous export of Indian corn to feed European countries, for which they pay us back by prohibiting our emigrant settlers, from lands, where our men had suffered hardships to clear the land of marshes and cultivate it⁴. Government declares scarcity in one part of India and from another part exports corn to other nations;⁵ the whole profiteering business being carried by European contractors and capitalists. Our peasantry sells the corn for the high prices offered, in order to satisfy the lashing tax-collector and turns to extract from the land more produce, which in course of time will deprive our cultivated areas of fertility and cause still greater scarcity. This system of causing dearth

¹ In the budget for 1921-22, Rs. 66 crores *i. e.* 51 p. c. of the total receipts are appropriated for military and in this it must be remembered that the European Jack-boot is paid 4 times more than the Indian Sepoy. Perhaps the Luxurious Moghul soldiers of Aurangzeb's camp required much less ! ² Sir William Vincent's speech in L. A, clearly reveals this motive. ³ Lord Curzon and Lord Sydenham are the best examples to illustrate this. ⁴ As in South and East Africa. ⁵ When scarcity was declared in Kaira district, 1.5 million tons of wheat 1.9 millions tons of rice were exported from India. Govt. complained for want of transport tonnage while 40,000 waggons were engaged in simply transporting coal. Foreign machinery must be first fed before starving Indian human beings !

finds a somewhat similar parallel¹ in French history before the Great Revolution. We will quote a few lines. "In the mean time, in contrast with this life in high places, poverty and misery had increased among the people, and most markedly among the cultivators of the soil, to a degree that would appear incredible, if we had not at hand the testimonies of men of all class, men who were more than moderate in their views. (Perhaps those very men are born amongst us to-day in our Moderate camp!) Speculators, seconded by Government, and the more covetous courtiers, traded on this misery and had organized what was termed by contemporaries the Pact of Hunger. By a series of market operations, the whole corn of the country was exported, and when the premium paid on exportations had been received, the whole stock was accumulated in Jersey and Guernsey and other depots and sold again, when the needs of the people, had reached their greatest extremity, at very high prices, as though it had arrived from America."² If the hunger-stricken peasantry of France answered this by the Reign of Terror were they to be blamed? And yet William Pitt and his liberty-loving (!) England bribed other nations to kill this France !!

The fourth method of impoverishment is the industrial development of India, which instead of benefitting us, intensifies our poverty, a phenomena quite peculiar to India. Indians clamour for the development of their resources. The Government with paternal love condescends to do that. Industries, that yield

¹. Such parallelisms between the Fr. peasantry before the Revolution and ours are not of our own making. Vaughan Nash, says in his "The Great Famine," referring to the rigorous collection of land revenue, "cold comfort this for people, who are brought as low as the peasants of France before the revolution, who have ruin and hunger as their daily portion, while plague and cholera stand over them ready to strike. To them appears the Govt. of the British Empire in the likeness of the Broker's man." ² Fr. Revolution. Mazzini p. p. 278.

vast profits are undertaken, not by Government, but by European capitalists. And the whole profits from them thus are poured into the pockets of White capitalism. Indian labour and India's resources are exploited, not for her people, but for foreigners. The railway companies, tea, jute and other plantations, mining concerns, shipping companies and such others yearly drain from India her wealth, in the shape of dividends to the share-holders 99% of whom are European capitalists. Where these are not benefitted industries are neglected and to add to the misery, the people are blamed for not advancing capital for the construction of their own industries. Someone has said in London, "You may have either flourishing industries or a flourishing bureaucracy; but never both." We certainly want the first; necessarily we must destroy the other? The two are mutually exclusive!

And the fifth method is Government's systematic gambling with regard to the currency. Indian merchants are prohibited to import Gold from foreign countries, where they have exported their goods, but they have to pay in gold for their imports. Gold flows out of India and instead we are given pieces of paper and nothing but paper; consider them worth a farthing or a thousand; after all the peasant cries in despair, "I have sold my life, my corn; and what have I got? Printed paper!" Our gold reserves lie locked in England, for White capitalism to grow fat over it and we are fed on printed paper. What wonder if one day we rise to find India bankrupt?

Besides this impending danger of national impoverishment and bankruptcy, we have to face another one, that of the evils of industrialization appearing in our society and becoming our inherent scourge as it has become of the Europeans. Political emancipation is the remedy for the first danger and we are struggling for it with methods, which we will notice in the next chapter. But even when we become politically free, how are we to avert the dangers of modernization, the dangers of the class war, between capital and labour. Because even the class war is showing its

head amongst us. The introduction of factory industries is drawing off more and more of our harrassed peasantry to the factory plants in large numbers and to take to the life of slavish wage-earners. Large populated areas in industrial towns well exhibit to what level of life our wage-earners are being reduced. Our society has already begun to breed the class of capitalists, which is the source of so much evil in Europe. When the cost of living rose extraordinarily high in times of war the Indian capitalists showed as much implacableness towards the demands of starving Indian labour as the European capitalists did. White capitalists can at least be excused on the ground that it is in their very nature and breeding to behave so towards the Indians: And who are the Indian capitalists. Most of our trade, foreign and inland, is centred in the hands of the Shethias of the Gujrathi community, the Marwaris, the Parsis and the Bohras. Allied as their interests are with the foreign Government and foreign capitalism, these capitalist communities of our Society are naturally opposed to our attempts at emancipation. And they in their turn exhibit all the greediness, idleness, cruelty, luxurious and demoralized life consequent upon capitalism in every form and in every country. The capitalist landholders ruin the middleclass-man by cornering large land-areas and then charging exorbitant rentals for the tenants¹. Some of them make a sham of starting industries for public benefit and under that pretext oust the peasantry from their holdings with the help of a despotic partial government².

¹ Charging high rentals had reached to such a high pitch of madness that in Bombay, a special Rent Act had to be enforced. But it has not proved very much effective. ² The ambitious capitalists, the Tatas, have proposed to supply electricity to Bombay Mills, for which they want to acquire lands by ousting the peasantry of Mulshi Peta lands in Poona Distr. The profits of mills go to millowners and profits of these works will go to the Tatas because 90 p. c. of the shares are held by their own circle ! A fine public interest !

Thus the Indian Capitalists are doing three since They support the foreign despotism over us. They demasses and ruin the peasantry and the wage-earning classes of our Society. Doing this they support and feed the capitalists of Europe and thus help the cause of misery of the workers of that continent also.

So we have to think of two things. How to throw off the foreign Yoke? With what methods? And then how to destroy evil of capitalism amongst us, which is making fast progress, and will double its speed when we are politically free. Mahatma Gandhi has put forth his methods of working out the destruction of these two monster diseases. Gandhism aims to cure Society of modern industrialization and modern civilization. At the same time, Bolshevism is working with the same view in Russia and in European Society. Since both the systems are working with a view to find a solution for a common evil, common to all nations and since both, fortunately or unfortunately, are born practically in the same era, we propose to compare and contrast these two systems of philosophy and action and try to see their efficiency to arrive at the desired results.

CHAPTER III.

Gandhi vs. Lenin.

On 15th March 1917 the success of the first Russian Revolution was announced to the world by the abdication of the Czar, the "Autocrat of all the Russias." The English statesmen and all the world hailed it as one step towards the realization of democracy in this world. But when Kerensky's Government was overthrown by the Second Russian Revolution of Nov. 7th and the Russian policy, directed by the Bolsheviks in the Soviet Govt. was changed by the peace with the central powers and when Russia withdrew from the war, then as if by magic, the British statesmen began to see the hedious monster of despotism and danger to the whole world, in the place, in which, not long ago, they were disposed to find the very heaven of democracy. They began to cry down the Bolsheviks and Russia as "Treacherous"; then refused to have any connection with her Government and began to spread news, of alleged devilish atrocities on the part of the Bolsheviks, in other nations. To attribute atrocities to one, whom we wish to put down and prejudice in the eyes of the world that he may not get a hearing, has always been a political dodge. And this was nothing but a repetition of what the British statesmen had done about Napoleon, in Ireland, so that Ireland might not sympathise and help the Emperor against England. However the storm cooled down. As a political necessity, commercial relations with Russia were renewed and Krasin, representative of the Bolshevik Govt. to England, sat in London in conference with British statesmen about the new relations between Russia and England. At least for a time the Red Flag of the Bolshevik waved in the Imperialistic atmosphere of scoffing London, though only over the flat that Krasin had rented for a time ! A labour deputation went to Russia to see

matters on the spot. Bolshevism that was never studied before the war, until it became the master of Russia, Bolshevism, that was howled down by the capitalistic states of Europe from all quarters, began to receive thoughtful consideration and even serious attention! Let us do the same.

Bolshevism, is not, like other sciences, simply a science of politics and economics, submitting itself to changes due to criticism. A true Marxian or a Bolshevik will admit of no change in the body of the theories of his faith. Karl Marx's Book the "Capital" is to the Bolshevik what the Geeta is to the Hindoo, or the Bible to the Christian. Day by day the very inspirer, Karl Marx, is passing into a Mythical Being. Bolshevism has come to acquire a force of religion, and all that inspired unflinching belief, that a religion demands.

The Bolshevik or rather the extremist Marxian sees the misery in the world, the poorer classes exploited by the rich and powerful and sets to investigate the causes of it and arrives at three conclusions, stored in these three words: Economic Materialism, Surplus Value, and the Class War.

The doctrine of economic materialism underlying all the extremist communist philosophy, simply means that almost all human activity is directed with the motive of economic aggrandisement, that "all the mass-phenomena of history are determined by economic motives." And if we examine great movements in history, most of them justify this view. The great so called religious movement in Europe, the Reformation, owed much of its success to the expected economic freedom of the states and of the people, promised by the Reformation, which absolved them from paying any tithes and taxes to the clergy and the Pope. Had it not been for this expectation of freedom of the masses from the oppressive taxes of the clergy and the Pope, it is doubtful whether all the printing inventions and philosophy of the scholars dispossessed and turned

out from Constantinople would have been sufficiently powerful to move the masses to accept the new creed and deny obedience to the papal authority. The whole of the French Revolution and its subsequent off-shoots in other nations, became possible, when the masses became utterly destitute and the Government bankrupt and unable to produce money by taxation. The expansion of the nations of Europe into the outside world would not have taken place but for the sight of the Spanish galleys, coming loaded with gold and silver from the Peruvian mines. It was the drain of their wealth into the coffers of England, that moved the Americans to fight for liberty, to begin that war of American Independence. So most of the greatest events of European history were inspired by economic motives.

Even in daily life man's whole struggle is primarily dominated by the desire to obtain money, money for existence, for luxury and then follow other motives of love, of friendship, of religion and morality.

After all this, what is the result of this dominating factor? The doctrine of economic materialism says that consequently all this leads to inequality of wealth, from which proceeds all the misery of the masses of the people, leads to the intolerable situation of some possessing crores and the many begging for bread or starving. Capitalism is the one end of this inequality and poverty of the masses, the other end.

Naturally the next question is, how have the rich or the capitalists come by so much wealth, how in modern society they continue to be so and daily increase in numbers? What is it that allows and facilitates the accumulation of unlimited wealth into the hands of a limited few, of wealth, which is the product of the combined labour of the whole of Society? And at this stage the doctrine of surplus value makes its appearance in the Marxian theory.

If a capitalist possesses capital in vast land-areas, (like the zamindars of Bihar, Orrissa and Bengal,) how has he come to possess so much land? Did he labour and sweat for it? If he has inherited it from his ancestors, did his ancestors labour for it? Land cannot be a product of human labour and consequently no human being can lay claim to any land-property through the right of labour. History shows that, "the appropriation of land by individuals has in most countries—probably in all where it approaches completeness—been originally effected, not by the expenditure of labour or the results of labour on the land, but by force. The original landlords have been conquerors¹." If the original possessors came by it by force, then their inheritors can show no reason why they should be allowed to retain it to the exclusion of others. One may say that they hold it for the common good of the whole community; but experience shows that land—owners, most of them if not all, have never shown themselves conscious of this idea of common good but have rather worked against it by converting lands into parks and hunting grounds as in England or by harrassing the temporary peasant tenant, who works more for the common good by his production than the landholders do by their idle unproductive act of possession. And even if admitted that they do hold it for the common good, Society is doubly justified in relieving this 'servant of common good' by directly administering the land *i. e.* nationalizing it.

Then one may say, that the property in land may have been bought by the capitalist owners from other possessors. But we have seen that property in land, in its very nature, cannot be a product of human labour but is an appropriation by force and as such it cannot be possessed, bought or sold by any individual to any other individual; because it is a possession of the social whole and cannot be disposed of in any form except through the consent of the social whole.

I. T. H. Green. "Principles of political obligation."

Then comes forth the question of capitalism in movable property, easily convertible in money and of capitalism in wealth as acquired profits of industry. Examine the working of all industries and we will find that physical labour, the backbone of all industries, remains, 'under-rewarded,' while intellectual labour, through speculation, through trade or through 'middle-manship', reaps the benefits of the activities of physical labour. Capitalists are brought into existence by the very laws governing modern systems of industrialization, by laws, which allow the intellectual few, masters of opportunities, to become possessors of the 'unearned income', of the surplus value derived from the production through physical labour of the many. Because always in society workers with hand are in a majority. Take the case of capitalist England. 'Ninety out of every hundred adults in England are workers with their hands. Most of these are living in districts and in houses, which make their free and healthy development impossible. Twenty-three out of every hundred live below the poverty line—that is to say they are so ill-clothed, so badly housed and so underfed that they die or are raked with premature pains before they are fifty years of age. Yet these men and women are producing and distributing food, clothing, and the luxuries, which they cannot afford to obtain for themselves." And the surplus value or profits from the labour of these becomes the private property of the capitalists, to which they are not at all entitled more than the hand-labourers. This is the main contention of Marx's doctrine of surplus value.

Having arrived at this the Marxian proceeds to argue and tries to find the method with which to remove this condition of the slavery of the proletariat to capitalism. Capitalists are able to be masters of the proletariat or the wage-earners, because they can control the means of production and through this control become owners of vast unearned wealth. What, if the state, the society, which is mostly composed of workers with hand were to

assume the direct control of these means of production, if production and distribution were so arranged that everybody would get what is his necessity and the surplus value of production be utilized for the common good of the state, if none were allowed to accumulate wealth and have private property in land or money, which is the root of so much evil? To accomplish this the workers and peasants must be the masters of the state-mechanism; they must wrest the authority of Government from the capitalists, who everywhere control the state mechanism in their own interests. And this can be done only through a class-war, through an 'Armed Revolution' of the workers and peasants.

The extremist Marxian firmly and religiously believes in this method of class-war and an armed revolution of the proletariat. A peaceful revolution to take over the control of the state and the means of production is impossible. It sounds absurd to tell a man who is habituated to control, not to control, and to expect that he would do it for the mere asking, unless he is forced to do so. Neither is the method of accomplishing this through the gradual growth of representative Governments, like the parliamentary democracy of England, possible. Because the Governments of to-day are dominated by the capitalists or the bourgeoisie class; they control the army, the press, the education and everything. Through educational institutions, they manufacture and spread, what is called the "Bourgeoisie Ideology", impose it upon the world and get it ingrained in the ideas and morality of the world. This ideology manufactures a set of laws by which any quantity of land may belong to private people and may pass from one to another by inheritance, by will or by sale; another set by which every one must pay taxes demanded of them unquestioningly and a third set, to the effect that any quantity of articles by whatever means acquired may become the absolute property of the people, who hold them. It is this teaching, which makes the workers and peasants instinctively obey despotic Governments, and paralyzes their

strength to seize the capitalists and accomplish their freedom. The capitalists teach that the poor shall always be in society but even so they had argued, when slavery existed that slavery and serfdom were necessary to maintain society, until they were abolished forcibly. Peaceful methods will do nothing. Because capitalist despotism is a thing that will stoop to anything to maintain its hold of injustice. An armed revolution of the workers and peasants, with all the fanaticism of a religious belief is the only remedy ; and such a revolution must be ready to fight the confederacy of all the capitalist states of the world and expect help from no one. A well known author, though against the Marxians or Bolsheviks says. "It seems evident from the attitude of the capitalist world to Soviet Russia, of the entente to the central powers and of England to Ireland and India, that there is no depth of perfidy, cruelty and brutality, from which the present holders of power will shrink, when they feel themselves threatened. If in order to oust them nothing short of fanaticism will serve, it is they, who are the prime sources of the resultant evil. And it is permissible to hope that when they have been dispossessed, fanaticism will fade, as other fanaticisms have faded in the past."¹

After this third item of an armed revolution the necessary form of Government, in absence of capitalism, will be the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, which is not to be a permanent factor of the state. For as soon as all shall be labourers, and no one a capitalist, as soon as the whole state will be identical with the proletariat, the Dictatorship will vanish of itself.

The Bolsheviks are the people in those icy zones of Russia, the white land of the Autocrat of all the Russias, who have been the ardent believers in these dogmas and methods of working them out, who have practically worked out this philosophy and are now ruling Russia. The Bolsheviks are the advance guard of all

1. Bertrand Russell.

communists, as they call themselves. Part of this communist philosophy finds expression in the programme of English labour party too, its aims being laid down in these four propositions, (a) The universal enforcement, of the national minimum (b) Democratic control of industry (c) Revolution in national finance, (d) and the surplus wealth for common good¹. The difference between the Bolsheviks and the British Labour party consist in this that the former advocate zealously a military blow against armed capitalism, while the latter believe in the method of attaining their end through the Parliament.

So far we have tried to understand the fundamental conceptions of Bolshevism or extremist communism, in which many thinkers have great faith. We will now turn to the underlying conceptions of Gandhism and its methods of work, to realize the end of the social evils of our day.

Gandhism admits all the vices from which Society of our day is suffering all the vices emanating from the rule of capitalism. It also concedes that Capitalism will stoop to anything to preserve its authority and a revolution or a radical change alone can redeem Society. But the point where Bolshevism and Gandhism are deadly opposed, is that of methods to work out the revolution in Society. Gandhism attacks the very foundations of modern social arrangements and divisions, introduced by modern industrialization. If Capitalism possesses all the cruelty and perfidy of ancient despotisms, what is it that brought into existence capitalism, and gave it such unbounded iron authority. If a majority of the wage—earning class is ill—housed, ill—fed, lives below the poverty line, what made these men the slaves of capitalism. The sure and certain answer is the modern system of industrialization. Mechanism, the Age of Machinery, drove the independent workers out of their healthy surroundings in villages and guild-unions, made them flock to the plantations to work in large units at the bidding of a capita-

1. Adopted at the Conference of June 1918.

list, Mechanism made possible, large scale productions, it spurned much of the human factor in industries and thus made a vain, acquisitive few with wealth, masters of millions of men. The Gandhian argues with Tolstoy, from whom Gandhism directly takes its inspiration, "The cause of the miserable position of the workers cannot be found in the seizure of the means of production by capitalists, the cause must lie in that which drives them from the villages. The labourer's misery alike on the Railway, in the silk factory, and every other factory or workshop—consists not in the longer or shorter hours of work (for agriculturists work sometimes eighteen hours a day and as much as thirty-six hours on end and consider their lives happy) nor does it consist in the low rate of wages, nor in the fact that the railway or factory is not theirs; but it consists in the fact that they are obliged to work in harmful unnatural conditions often dangerous and destructive to life and to live a barrack life in town—a life full of temptations and immorality and to do compulsory labour at another's bidding." And the thing that does this, the Gandhian says, is modern mechanism, in fact, the whole of modern civilization. Logic pushed forward in this way naturally concludes that to remove the evils of our day then, modern age of mechanism must be destroyed. Mechanism has made luxuries easily accessible at low cost and this is breeding idleness in Society, has bred a class living on the labour of others. To destroy this the necessities of man must be cut down, and at the same time everybody must be working to provide for himself by his own labour. None must be idle, for an "idler is a thief¹."

For this as a remedy Gandhism proposes a return to the old methods of spinning and weaving on handlooms, which would naturally dissolve the labour mass into smaller units. To-day one nation produces so much of luxuries of cloth and other things that the production aims to provide for all the markets of the world, which results in the unemployment and privations of the labour of other

1 Rousseau.

nations. Hand-spinning and weaving will make this ambition impossible ; it will not drive the worker from his independent village environments and make him submit to the slavery of capitalism. But this is simply one branch of the programme of Gandhism to dissolve modern civilization. Monstrous mechanism that support despotism, factories, railways and everything that now raises the problem of human misery, and problem of the class-war must go that humanity may be saved. But how will men leave ideas and habits that they have come to acquire by custom and by education? So the root of the whole thing lies in the minds of men. And the solution cannot be anywhere else but in the minds of men. It lies in "Purification". Gandhism will say to workmen, "The workmen must cleanse themselves in order that the Governments and wealthy shall cease to devour their lives. Impurity breeds in dirt and it feeds on strange bodies only while they are unclean. And therefore for the deliverance of the workers from their calamities there is only one means—that of purifying themselves. And to purify themselves, liberation from theological, state, and scientific superstitions is necessary and necessary also is faith in God and His Law¹." To free oneself from despotism, Gandhism proposes a method, which is directly opposed to that of Bolshevism. There is no use finding the remedy outside man. It lies in the mind. If the whole mode of thinking be changed then alone there can be any change in the external actions of man, for action is practical embodiment of thought. Those motives that lead to all this struggle of class-war, motives of aggrandisement, vanity, rivalry and love of power, if these are cast out of the "possessed", then man will be free. Go on multiplying invention, after invention conquer the whole of Nature, external to man, and what will be the result? There is that immutable law, applicable to all such methods of finding happiness, the law, "That a man is subject to a law of his being, in virtue of which he at once seeks self-satisfaction and is prevented

1 Tolstoy. "Social Evils and their Remedy". P 58.

from finding it in the objects in which he actually desires and in which he ordinarily seeks it¹."

And the way to reform it? The Bolsheviks demand power, Dictatorship of the Proletariat, as they say, to reform human mind, to dispossess capital and to teach everyone in Society to work for the common good. The Gandhians say that men must be convinced of their duty of working for the common good. And this convincing can be done only through Religion. "Your work must be a work of regeneration, of moral reform—for without this any political organization is barren and you delude yourselves with the expectation of success while you banish from your work the religious idea²." The cry of the Revolution must be "God wills it; God wills it." For "Without God you can command, not persuade, you can be tyrants in your turn, never educators and apostles.³" An 'armed revolution' or violence will be followed by nothing but a new kind of tyranny and violence.

So Gandhism requires first a change in human nature or purification, which in due course will destroy the necessity of the present systems of life. Destroy vanity, love of show and there will be no necessity to engage wage-earning slaves to produce silks and luxuries. Destroy fear and love of power, wars will stop, and militarisms and Governments will melt. Destroy the devil within man and the outside nature of incongruities will die out. Lenin might as well answer to this, "Destroy the universe and God himself, who is the cause of all this and everything will stop; a madman's reasoning; an impossibility!"

Many in India are under the impression that the principles of non-violence and religious transformation in Gandhism are due to the peculiar circumstances of India; that Gandhism advocates non-violence because violence is not possible here against the Government.

1. T. H. Green. "Principles of Political Obligation." pp. 19. 2. Mazzini pp. 168. 3. Mazzini pp. 29.

Armed revolution being an impossibility, non-violence has become the order, of the day. But it is a gross mistake to suppose that. Even if Gandhi were just now to be transferred to the throne of Lenin, he would dissolve the Red Gards and the Proletarian Dictatorship; he would stop the industrialization of Russia and give in her hands the spinning wheel and the handloom.

Gandhism has two aspects. One relates to the general evils, common to all human Society and treats of the solution of problems affecting all. Another aspect treats of the special evil of despotism and proposes means to do away with it. We have treated of the first aspect. We will treat a little of the second.

If any country is subjected to despotism, whether foreign or native, in what way shall it subvert this despotism? Surely not by a military war, whether possible or not. Gandhism has put forward its plan of 'non-violent non-co-operation.' This plan is directly inspired by Tolstoy's plan of 'non violent non-participation' for the Russians. Tolstoy's plan was abandoned by Russia. India has adopted Gandhi's plan. Instead of giving the plan of Gandhism we will give that of Tolstoy. On pursuance of it we will find that it was Tolstoy, who ruled the Congress of Calcutta, where the first principles of it were outlined and Gandhi was his representative! Tolstoy, cast out of Russia, has been born amongst us.

The underlying conception of the plan is simply this that tyrants tyrannize because the tyrannized slaves participate in the act. Tolstoy gives three comprehensive commandments to a non-violent non-co-operator.

"He should first of all, neither willingly nor under compulsion take any part in Government activity and should therefore be neither a soldier nor a field-marshal nor a minister of State nor a tax-collector nor a witness nor an elderman nor a jurymen nor a governor, nor a member of Parliament, nor in fact hold any office connected with violence. That is one thing.

"Secondly, such a man should not voluntarily pay taxes to Govt. either directly or indirectly nor should he accept money collected by taxes either as salary or as pension or as a reward, nor should he make use of Government institutions supported by taxes collected by violence from the people.

"Thirdly a man, who desires to promote not his own well-being alone, but to better the position of people in general, should not appeal to Govt. violence for the protection of his possessions in land or in other things nor to defend him and his near ones, but should possess land and all products of his own or other people's toil, in so far as others do not claim them from him."

Tolstoy anticipated our moderates, and continuing says, "People will say, 'But such an activity is impossible; to refuse all participation in Governmental affairs means to refuse to live.' A man, who does not pay taxes will be punished and the tax will be collected from his property; a man, who having no other means of livelihood, refuses Govt- service will perish of hunger, with his family; the same will befall a man, who rejects Govt, protection for his property and his person; not to make use of things that are taxed or of Govt. institutions is quite impossible. as the most necessary articles are often taxed and just the same way it is impossible to do without Govt. institutions, such as the posts, roads, etc."

But there is the cool and deliberate answer of his to this. "Not everyone will be able to do this at once, but as men will begin to feel the consciousness of these things they will begin to act.¹"

From the foregoing discussion it will be clear that Gandhism relies on individual purification, individual consciousness and conviction and individual action. Gandhism always lays stress upon

1. Tolstoy : "The slavery of our Times."

the necessity of allowing everyone to act according to his conscience. It has unbounded faith in the inherent goodness of human nature, and believes that man left to himself to act according to his conscience will work out nothing but the good of himself and of his community. Complete absence of coercion of any kind and complete freedom of action find high credence in the elaborate system of Gandhism. (This nearly verges upon the English idea of liberty that minimum of government control or coercion is maximum of individual liberty¹.) Bolshevism does not believe in the inherent goodness of human nature but advocates rather maximum of coercion or control (though as a passing phase) to teach man his duty towards the common good of the whole. Gandhism wishes to make a gift to the world of an Indian Empire, a Nationality founded on the basis of Universal Peace, (Ahimsâ,) peace between man and man, and between man and every sentient creature. It is a fair dream, an earnest ideal. Practical Lenin, with the vision before him of a world-confederacy of the wolfish capitalist militarisms, always ready to shatter the peace of the poor man and of nations, ready to butcher liberty in its very infancy in any form, slowly murmurs, "In the hoary past the mighty Asoka had set up an Empire and had tried to rule it according to his principles of Ahimsa of non-violence". Where is that fabric of Ahimsa now? Alas! ruthlessly shattered by the shock and collision of historic forces. Perhaps the Prime Maker of history has ordained that the world should pass through the process of a painful historic development from the brute to the man. Call upon the mighty nations of the earth to lay down their pride and hate, their sceptres and swords, and with redemptive humility, love and sacrifice, to fight in union the forces of rebarbarization and they will laugh at you. Return their laugh with a thrash of the sword, with the very implements they have forged and you will be at peace, or ye shall be captive of their

1. Seeley, "Introduction to Political Science." Hegel, 'Philosophy of History.' 2. See edicts of Asoka.

passions!" A painful mysterious future, indeed, before us! But once more the land of Buddha has determined to follow Buddhism or Gandhism ; may the fabric be not shattered again !!

To recapitulate :—

Gandhi and Lenin.

Common aim :—To destroy social evils of the day, especially the misery of the poor and to subvert despotism.

Gandhi.	Grounds.	Lenin.
Cause :—Modern Civilization, specially modern industrialization and the consequent vices of humanity.		Cause :—Seizure of the means of production, land etc. by the capitalists, the inequality of wealth and consequent impoverishment of the proletariat, who form the majority of humanity.

Remedy.

Remedy :—Destroy the spirit of modern civilization and mechanism.	Remedy :—Keep modern acquisitions but make them work for the common good <i>i. e.</i> utilize the surplus value, which now goes to the rich, by nationalizing the means of production.
---	--

Steps.

- | | |
|--|--|
| i. Despotism of capital and of every kind must go. | 1. Despotism of capital and of every kind must go. |
|--|--|

- | | |
|---|---|
| 2. Despotism rests on force. | 2. Despotism rests on force. |
| 3. The force is made possible and maintained by those who are tyrannized over, by their participation or co-operation with the work of the Army, Taxation and Law of the despots. | 3. The participation is not willingly given but is exacted by force, not necessarily supplied from the ranks of the tyrannized. |
| 4. Let all non-co-operate and the edifice will fall. | 4. The all will never do so, because the interests of the majority are allied with that of the existing tyranny. The minority alone will work out the downfall and the majority will follow. |
| 5. Religion and non-violence alone can do this. For religion will teach the emptiness of modern acquisitions. Violence is usurped by violence: Non-violence will be followed by non-violence and chaos will be prevented, which is imminent upon the subversion of despotic power, as is shown by revolutions in history. | 5. Tyranny will not be moved by religion, non-violence and such other humane motives. Despotism will go so far, as to exterminate the whole race of liberators. So it must be undermined and suppressed by its own means and ways. The chaos after the fall is temporary and men tired of the chaos soon evolve order, as shown by history. |

6. When despotism falls at the hand of religion and non-violence, a religious order of Society will be the outcome. Spirit of Religion, conscious of the emptiness of modernization, will necessarily destroy it for the sake of common good. The Law will be the Law of conscience of man and Humanity. Conscience will by its nature work for social good. And evils of capital, labour and the class war will disappear in such Society. So Purify men.
6. The dictates of conscience are vitiated by many external forces, unless it is highly enlightened. It is not found in average men, and requires generations to evolve. So men must be compulsorily made to work for social good, which the capitalists being unwilling to do, the proletariat must do by establishing their Dictatorship. Compulsion will generate a habit to work for common good and to hold everything for common good. Habit will be turned into an acquired instinct. When the instinct is acquired, the Dictatorship will naturally vanish, being a mere passing phase and instrument.
7. The end is a Society of worshippers of God and Religion and living according to the dictates of conscience.
7. The end is a Society of workers and no idlers, working instinctively for the common good of the whole.

Source.

Tolstoy.

Karl Marx.

|
Gandhism.|
Bolshevism or Leninism.

Sphere of work.

India.

Russia.

CHAPTER IV.

“The Armed Blow.”

So far we have discussed the broad underlying principles of Gandhism and Bolshevism. Anybody can see that the complete realization of the theories of both the systems in practical life is an impossibility. Gandhism suffers from too much and unwarranted faith in the natural goodness of human nature, while Bolshevism suffers from the too much neglect of human interests and sentiments. And so is it that absolute theories, in the process of application to practical life, suffer from modification according to circumstances. The blame does not lie with those, who conceive them, but rather with those, who receive them. Gandhism advocated and still advocates the strictest observation of the law of conscience, everyone to be allowed to act according to the dictates of it. This naturally means that no law passed by a majority can be binding over the minority.¹ If so then every act of legislation will have to obtain the full consent of every member of the state, failing which, there can be no legislation, in fact, no government; and the state will have to drift into a philosophical anarchy or Kingdom of God! Absolute theories pushed to the end arrive at such queer results and yet, no one, with common sense, can say that the advocates of liberty of conscience mean seriously to bring about in practice the latter stage of reasoning. And because such extreme reasoning cannot be brought into practice, Gandhism admits to be bound and guided by congress resolutions and votes of the majority! Even the Bolsheviks, the most uncompromising of political—nay, religious—parties has to make concessions to the pressing needs of the time. Bolshevism that would recognize no private property of any kind has been brought to admit the right of the

¹ Gandhi : Indian Home-rule.

peasants over their soil and its produce and thus to recognize the class of peasant proprietors owning private property in land. To be allowed to say, "This is mine" even of a farthing or a piece of sod, is a comfort and solace to the human heart and as long as this great 'my' 'mine' are not destroyed, no Dictatorship can avail to make man hold anything of his in common for common good¹. However Bolshevism is a noble and heroic attempt to achieve the ideal. It may fail. But to-day at least it has given to Russia a strong Government, peace and bread and it is expected that Russia before long will be happy. Bolshevism has subverted the old Czarist despotism and it will be much profitable if we trace a little the course of events that led the Bolsheviks to power. The study of Revolutions yields very interesting results !

The Czar became an ally of England, France and the petty quarrelsome states of Southern Europe and began the Great War of 1914. In truth the war was not for any high principle or for the professed protection of the liberty of any nation ; but it was for the interests of the moneyed high classes, for the protection of their industries and markets and for the destruction of unfavourable competition. As usual, those, for whose interests the war was fought, gave it a colour of patriotism, of a struggle for preservation of civilization and thus duped the people into support of it. The Russians for long were striving for liberty in their own land. Their constitutional agitation had failed. Their terrorist movement had failed. The war gave them the opportunity. The old peasantry, which in times of peace was crushed with repression by Czarist despotism, when it agitated for rights, was now turned into a military organization and it was just the thing that was needed. The long-standing grievance of the peasantry was that they should be allowed to own the lands they cultivated, in place

¹ As a preparation for the service of common good or 'Lokasangraha' man must first destroy his 'Mamatva', 'Ahankara' or sense of egoism Gesta.

of the nobles, who never looked to them except for the ruinous taxes and forced labour. The peasantry was denied this right. The war converted this self-same peasantry into a military class and with it Czardom was doomed.

The intellectualls realized the change and they set to work. They taught the people that the war was not for them and if won, would not benefit them but the high lords, their oppressors. They moved the peasantry to overthrow despotism and created in them the confidence to do so. To this were added the horrors of scarcity of bread in Russia and the disastrous defeats at the Front. The cry of the Bolsheviks, the most ardent agitators, became, "Land, Bread and Peace." With this cry the Revolution began. And when the command of Czarist despotism to shoot the patriots failed to evoke any answer from the military, on whose strength it had ruled for centuries, the success of the Revolution was assured, "The war assigned the decisive role in the Revolution to the army and the old army was the peasantry."¹

"Had the Revolution developed more normally that is in conditions of peace-time, such as prevailed in 1912, when it really began, the proletariat would have taken the leading role throught whilst the peasant masses would have been gradually towed along by the proletariat into the Revolutionary whirlpool. But the war imparted an entirely different logic to the course of events. The army had organised the peasantry not on a political but on a military basis. Immediately the Revolution broke out, the advanced sections of the proletariat revived the traditions of 1905 by calling upon the popular masses to organize in representative bodies *viz* the "councils" of delegates (Soviets.)

The army thus had to send representatives to revolutionary bodies before its potitical consciousness in any way corresponded to

¹ L. Trotsky. 'History of the Russian Revolution.'

the level of the rapidly developing revolutionary events, whom could the soldiers send as their representatives? Naturally, only those intellectuals and semi-intellectuals who were to be found in their midst and who possessed at least a minimum amount of political knowledge and who were capable of giving utterance to it. In this way, by the will of the awakening army, the lower middle—class intellectuals found themselves suddenly raised to a position of enormous influence. Doctors, engineers, lawyers journalists, who in pre-war days led a humdrum private life and laid no claim of any sort to political influence, became, overnight, representatives of whole crops and armies and discovered that they were the “leaders” of the Revolution. ‘The haziness of their political ideas fully corresponded to the formless state of the revolutionary consciousness of the masses themselves.’ This half-hearted revolutionary party, raised to power looked down upon the Bolsheviks contemptuously and also upon the social demands of the workers and peasants. For a time the new party in power enjoyed respect of the electorates. Immediately the question of the war came before the new Government party, claiming to be representative of the people. But as the party belonged to the middle-class bourgeoisie, they did not possess that hatred for the war as the masses had. And so the party decided upon the continuation of the war. And that was the fatal mistake. The whole army *i. e.* the peasantry and the workers were disgusted with the Government of the hazy politicians, of the type of Kerensky, who was gradually becoming anti-revolutionary, and other leaders. The Bolsheviks, who so long were in a minority and were confidently biding their time, and whom the Government of Kerensky was trying to sternly repress, came to the forefront, with their resolute principles and their war-cry “Land, bread and peace!” This was exactly what the masses wanted and the new Government failing to give that was easily overthrown. Kerensky’s Government failed to satisfy the peasants and his fall was inevitable.

To avert the calamity of his fall Kerensky and his Government ordered the Petrograd Garrison to cantonments on the Front, since that Garrison was the most revolutionary and opposed to Kerensky and his half-hearted policy. The Congress of the Soviets was to meet on November 7th and that day was fixed for the Armed Blow of the Bolsheviki, which was to have for its object the conquest of the supreme Government authority by the Soviets. The anti-Bolsheviki tried hard to suppress the rising. But the Bolsheviki were supported by the army. "The masses flocked to us irresistibly and their spirit rose higher and higher. Delegates would arrive from the trenches and ask us, at the sittings of the Petrograd Soviet, 'How long will this unbearable situation last? The soldiers have authorised us to tell you that if by the 15th of November no decisive steps are taken towards the peace, the trenches will be evacuated and the whole army will march back to the rear!'"

The Bolsheviki decided upon fulfilling their promise of the publication of all secret treaties. The soldiers would exclaim, "you say that full authority should pass into the hands of the Soviet? Then take it. Are you afraid that the front may not support you? Cast aside all doubt; the over-whelming mass of the soldiers are entirely on your side."

The Bolshevik party appointed a Military Revolutionary Committee which appointed Commissioners to all railway stations. They kept all in-coming and out-going trains under close supervision. A continuous telephonic and motor connection was set up with all the neighbouring towns. The lower ranks of the railway servants at the stations and railway workers gave ready recognition to their Commissioners.

But at the Telephone Exchange on November 6th, the telephone girls came out in opposition to the Soviet. The M. R. Committee sent a detachment and two small guns. So began the seizure of the administrative offices. Sailors and Red Guards

were stationed in small detachments at the Telegraph Office, at the Post Office, and other public offices, and measures were taken to gain possession of the State Bank. The Smolny Institute became the Soviet centre, where the M. R. C. sat in permanent session. The moment was drawing near.

On November 7th the Government in Winter Palace seized a Bolshevik paper. The Bolsheviks surrounded the Palace and thus began the fight. News of the fight was brought to the M. R. C. at the Smolny Institute, and of the first victims on the Bolshevik side. "Everyone rose as though moved by some invisible signal and with a unanimity, which is only provoked by a deep moral intensity of feeling, sung a Funeral March. He, who lived through this moment, will never forget it. The meeting came to an abrupt end. It was impossible to sit there, calmly discussing the theoretical question as to the method of constructing the Government, with the echo reaching our ears of the fighting and firing at the walls of the Winter Palace." But the news of the fall and flight of Kerensky arrived. The Bolsheviks had won.

Kerensky tried to storm Petrograd with the help of the ignorant Cossacks, whom he led to believe that the Petrograd garrison was expecting them and longing for their help. But the truth came out and the Cossacks dispersed.

The Bolsheviks at once followed up their success, resolutely organized the Govt. machinery and established the Dictatorship of the Workers, Peasants and Soldiers. They concluded peace with Germany and delivered Russia from destruction. This peace brought upon them the wrath of the English and the French. The invasions of General Denikin and General Wrangel were repelled, for no one could withstand the vigour of the new life of the nation; and Russian Revolution and Liberty once more escaped from falling into the bondage of the capitalist states of Europe. In the earlier campaigns the Red Army, the mainstay of the Bolsheviks, was worsted for want of veteran generals to lead and skilled hands

in the army to help the military manœuvres, for, these were formerly supplied by the old nobility, who of course disdained to follow the new masters, their inveterate enemies. But soon the rank and file of the masses produced best generals and best soldiers. The Revolution had produced a new feeling of ardour, a new sense of health and power, which found expression in the enthusiasm of the soldiers. The soldiers did not care to see whether the new Government was a Dictatorship or a Democracy. It was sufficient for them to know that the Government was *theirs* and that it was threatened. They fought with all the zeal of a religious war. The danger was averted and peace restored.

Since Bolshevism became master of Russia, governments of all countries have been trying to discredit it in the minds of their people, by painting it as devilish, atrocious and despotic. Every move bearing the least resemblance to communist activity is being repressed and the Bolsheviks are cut off from communicating with the people of any nation. Why is it so? What is the secret reason for this hatred? The reason lies in the avowed international policy of the Bolsheviks. In the 'Theses presented to the Second Congress of the Third International (of July 1920), there is an article by Lenin, called 'First Sketch of the theses on National and Colonial Questions.' A passage in it runs thus:—

'The present world—situation in politics places on the order of the day the dictatorship of the proletariat¹; and all the events of world politics are inevitably concentrated round one centre of gravity! The struggle of the international bourgeoisie² against the Soviet Republic,³ which inevitably groups round it on the one hand the Sovietist movements of the advanced working men of all countries, on the other hand all the national movements of emancipation of colonies and oppressed nations, which have been convinced

1 *i. e.* the working class. 2 *i. e.* the middle-class capitalists.

3 *i. e.* Republican councils of the working people and peasants.

by a bitter experience that there is no salvation for them except in the victory of the Soviet Government over world-imperialism.

It is henceforth necessary to pursue the realization of the strictest union of all the national and colonial movements of emancipation with Soviet Russia, by giving to this union forms corresponding to the degree of evolution of the proletarian movement¹ among the proletariat of each country, or of the democratic-bourgeois² movement of emancipation among the workers and peasants of backward countries or backward nationalities."

Such avowed aggressive international policy, of helping and instigating the labour and peasantry of every country to dispossess capital, has naturally aroused the hatred of the capitalist states of the world towards Soviet Russia. In accordance with this policy and in conformity with his promise 'to answer the guns of Germany with his leaflets' Lenin succeeded in overthrowing much of capitalism in Germany and helping the socialist labour in that country. The same danger (!) threatened all the other capitalist states of Europe. America and Japan were too far away to seriously think of the Russian Soviet programme. So England, France and other states hastened to avert the danger to their capitalist classes, and the speedy and best method, they thought of, was to make war upon Russia, on her own soil and put an end to the Soviet Government with all the fruits of the Revolution. Had Karl Marx been alive he would have called it a war for the preservation and protection of a class of murderers! Napoleon had failed to carry war to the heart of Russia, with all his powers of a great general. So also Germany with her best generals and army could not do it. What these had attempted vainly, England and France hoped to achieve through the dwarf-intellects of General Wrangel and General Denikin.

1 *Viz.* to assist the labour movement of England. 2 *Viz.* to assist the movement of emancipation of countries like Ireland, Egypt and India.

England had never shown her readiness to learn lessons from History. Otherwise the ghost of distracted Napoleon with the flower of his army buried in the snows of the heart of Russia, would have foreshadowed the result of the campaigns of the two generals. But it was not to be; and the expected happened. Armies of exhausted England and France were no match for the Reds of Lenin, fired with all the enthusiasm of a Revolution and of a feeling that the Govt. was theirs and that it was in danger. The war ended with disgrace for both the countries. Just so England had tried to kill the French Revolution in 1793 and had succeeded after a struggle of twenty-two years in 1815. But in 1918, a century later the same move failed. And why? A century means much to the bravery and spirit of a nation, embarked on the mad policy of acquisition? A century from 1815 to 1918 meant that England could not kill the Russian Revolution !!

However the confederacy was dissolved and peace concluded. The Bolsheviks have fulfilled their promises. "Land, Bread and Peace," they have given to Russia. According to the prophesy of their Guru, Karl Marx, they had expected a confederacy. But they succeeded in destroying it. They have given a strong and capable Government to Russia, which is just the need of any country, that has passed through a Revolution. Dictatorship of the Bolsheviks, or rather of Lenin is now the Government of Russia. A little picture of the Dictator will not be out of place here. We will quote the words of one who had seen him and spoken with him. "Soon after my arrival in Moscow I had an hour's conversation with Lenin in English, which he speaks fairly well. An interpreter was present but his services were scarcely required. Lenin's room is very bare; it contains a big desk, some maps on the walls, two book-cases, and one comfortable chair for visitors in addition to two or three hard chairs. It is obvious that he has no love of luxury or even comfort. He is very friendly, and apparently simple, entirely without a trace of

hauteur. If one met him without knowing who he he was, one would not guess that he is possessed of great power or even that he is in any way eminent. I have never met a personage so destitute of self-importance. (Seems to be a Gandhian in this respect!) He looks at his visitors very closely and screws up one eye, which seems to increase alarmingly the penetrating power of the other. He laughs a great deal; at first his laugh seems merely friendly and jolly, but gradually I came to feel it rather grim. *He is dictatorial, calm, incapable of fear, extraordinarily devoid of self-seeking, an embodied theory.....His strength comes, I imagine, from his honesty, courage, and unwavering faith—religious faith in the Marxian gospel, which takes the place of the Christian martyr's hopes of Paradise.*¹ Dictatorial, calm, incapable of fear, extraordinarily devoid of self-seeking, an embodied theory! There is no wonder, if the such a man, ere long, hunted from place to place and compelled to live an underground life, should become the Sovereign, the Dictator of Russia!

Has the Russian Revolution any significance in the History of Mankind? Or is it simply a spectacle of mean scrambling for political power on the part of ambitious parties, wending their way to the throne through bloodshed of man? Wars and Revolutions there have been, but many of them would not have been there but for the comprice of vain monarchs or for the interests of a class of power-hunters. Does the Russian Revolution belong to the same category or has it something new to announce to the world, as the French Revolution had? Let us see.

¹ Bertrand Russell had been to Russia on behalf of the Labour Deputation and had an interview with Lenin. Russell is not a whole-hearted communist. (The italics are ours.)

There are two institutions, on the common platform of which, men unite with a common purpose. And the two institutions are Religion and the State. The first is designed to promote the moral developement of the human soul and we may term this institution, as an invisible, non-material plan, in which men unite *subjectively*. The State is designed to promote the interests of man external to himself, of his interests in *things*, which cannot identify themselves with or assimilate in his personality or Idea. And this second institution is a material, visible, plan, in which men unite *objectively*. Yet each in itself contributes to the developement of the other and sometimes Religion has completely dominated the State, and sometimes the State has dominated Religion. The two are inter-dependant, but we are speaking only of the State mechanism and revolutions in its construction. The idea of this instrument or institution for the objective unity of interests in men has gone through many stages of evolution and one of the most despotic, poisonous, hard-dying stage was that completed by the French Revolution. That Revolution completed one phase of the idea about the State Mechanism, as to who should be the director of it. The idea that the possession of authority should be in the hands of one man, assisted by high grandees was destroyed and in 1793, the new idea, of the possession being transferred to the people, the ordinary citizen, was heralded, and the work of destruction was begun. To complete the work begun by 1793, Europe required hundred and twenty five years, *i. e.* the year 1918 had to dawn until History saw the work of destruction begun by 1793 perfectly accomplished at least in Europe. The Russian Revolution is at once an end and a beginning. It is an end of the work of destroying absolutism in the high state-

lords. But it also heralds a new period. The Fr. Revolution stage tried to give the authority in the State in the hands of the ordinary citizen but in course of events, it went into the hands of the middle-class intellectuals or the bourgeoisie and the overwhelming mass of ordinary citizens remained just as it was before the period. The Russian Revolution is a beginning of the destruction of this '*bourgeois period*' and heralds a new day of the '*labour period*.' This is the significance of the Bolshevik Revolution. So from Serfdom to Bourgeois-slavery and from Bourgeois-slavery to the Soviet or Labour period ; such are the stages of evolution in the Idea of the State Mechanism, the symbol of the objective unity of human interests.

CHAPTER V.

The Indian Revolution.

We have remained too much in the foreign land of Russia and perhaps talked too much over it. But we hope to be excused on the ground that not only we, but the wisest heads in all nations are being irresistibly drawn towards that country, by its latest noble and heroic success and the new stage in History, that it announces. Another reason is that a forbidden fruit is the most tempting. Our high master-grinders try to discredit every move of ours by calling it a "Bolshevik move." If the people of India wish to retain their Paradise, they must be kept away from this forbidden fruit, 'Bolshevism'. But while our high masters pose to act as angels to keep us away from it, secretly they act the Satan, driving us towards the forbidden fruit ! Simply the Satan of the old story did it more gently by simply whispering. These of today lash us on the way !

What is the prospect before us ? We are embarked on the struggle for independence, and how do we hope to win it ? Our constitutional agitation has accomplished almost nothing, beyond arousing the nation. We now want a Revolution, surely not with an "Armed Blow," a Revolution that is the most radical and sweeping change. The theoretical plan of accomplishing it, we have noticed in the third chapter. Let us try to see in what position we will drift, when we put it into practice.

First with regard to the movement of spinning and weaving on the *charka*, which in the hyperbolical language is styled, as our 'munitions' for battle. What will this move bring about ? One thing. It will irritate the English capitalists and English labour. Food and Clothing are the two things that eat up the greatest part of man's income or require the greatest expenditure of the wealth of a nation for their production. As for food India is self-sufficient at least to the extent that it does not drain our wealth. But for clothing

we have to depend upon England. It drains sixty crores of rupees yearly from our country. If the movement of spinning and weaving succeeds, it will make India richer by sixty crores yearly, and England poorer by the same amount. By it the English capitalists will lose their profits and the English labour will lose employment worth that much amount. Then how is it that British labour professes hearty support to our movement. The reason is simple. The labour of that country is at present employed in a death-struggle with the capitalists. The meaning of the struggle will be clear if we will see in whose hands the greatest part of the wealth of England is locked :—

Mr. Pathick Lawrence has distributed the private wealth of the United Kingdom in 1913-14 among the rich, comfortable and poor classes in the following proportions.

Rich (owners of more than £ 10,000)... 64 p. c. of the aggregate wealth.

Comfortable (owners of between £1,000

and £ 10,000) ... 24 p. c. „

Poor (owners of less than £ 1,000) ... 12 p. c. „

But by how many persons is this 64% of the aggregate wealth held ?

Percentage of population :—Rich ... 2 per cent

Comfortable ... 10 „ „

Poor ... 88 „ „

So we see that 64% of the whole wealth is enjoyed by only 2% of the population, 24% by 10% of the population and only 12% by 88% of the population. The labour of England means this 88% and its struggle means to get a share in the enormous volume of 64% held by the capitalists. As long as the British labour is not given a share in this enormous volume, it will help the Indian movement, because by our struggle, we are harassing the British

capitalists also and thus helping the Labour movement of England. So it will be clear that the Labour party of England is professing sympathy for us not from any philanthropic motives or from an inherent liking for liberty of other nations. It is a sympathy generating from quite selfish motives. The Indian labour interests and the British labour interests are mutually opposed. Independent India would mean full development of our industries in all branches and an efficient, organized labour. That in turn would mean a stop to the vast mass of the expenditure of British labour, that is now employed for the needs of India. So sooner or later, we will have to struggle with the Labour party also, if it comes into power in Parliament by ousting the present capitalist powers. This much is the meaning of the spinning and weaving movement in the programme of Non-co-operation. Suppose it fails to create a political crisis in the movement of labour vis. capital in England, what is our next weapon? Because we are quite conscious of the limitations of this move. At the most it will feed the poor by giving them work and make India richer by sixty crores.

But what shall be our next step? The great power of England cannot be shaken by such a feeble blow. Have we then no future? We have. We have this before us. "A race which is suffering from the oppression of an alien conqueror could win its freedom without any resort to force or armed violence. First the people must become convinced of the necessity of freedom, and, that accomplished, they must decline any longer to co-operate in the administration of the foreign power. Instead, they must build up their own State, within the State of those who have arrogated the role of rulers. Before long, if the people are united, the external state must crumble to pieces as the inner State grows in fullness. The alien Government may have enormous armies, machine-guns, tanks, poison-gas, aeroplanes and bombs but even by the most remorseless use of them it could never defeat resistance of this character. It may kill, but the very dead will work for its overthrow." We are convinced of the necessity for freedom. That

accomplished, we are trying to build an inner State. How? The alien State creates a moral prestige through its Educational and Legal Institutions. If the feelings of awe and obedience, created through them are destroyed, the alien Government becomes morally extinct. This we have accomplished by the movement of the boycott of schools and colleges and Law Courts. We know that the boycott is not complete, but even the partial success has created the necessary feeling of considering the institutions as worthless and has destroyed the feeling of awe towards Government authority. The moral ground destroyed, on what then, does it rest now? Essentially on its military basis. The British Government in India is morally extinct; now only the military Government is existing, by which we are coerced into submission to it. This militarism is maintained by us with our men and money. The army of the Indian Government is roughly three lacs of men out of which two lacs are supplied by our native races. In our struggle will these two lacs hold themselves aloof from the Government and refuse action? If we refuse taxes to the Government and if the Government decides upon terrorism, as they are doing in Ireland, will the native army work or refuse? The ranks of the natives are filled in by men from United Provinces, the Punjab, Nepal and Bhutan and by some Pathan tribes. As Prof. Seely expects, if the nationality movement gains the native army, the British Empire in India will be at an end. "For we are not really conquerors of India, and we cannot rule her as conquerors; if we undertook to do so, it is not necessary to enquire whether we could succeed, for we should assuredly be ruined financially by the mere attempt." Even Mahatma Gandhi believes that the native army will refuse work, and says, "One lac of Europeans, without our help can only hold less than one-seventh of our villages each, and it would be difficult, for one man, even when physically present, to impose his will on, say, four-hundred men and women-the average population of an Indian

village.”¹ The last item of Gandhian programme is this. “We shall continue patiently to educate them (masses) politically till they are ready for safe action. As soon as we feel reasonably confident of non violence continuing among them in spite of provoking executions, we shall certainly call upon the sepoy to lay down his arms and the peasantry to suspend payment of taxes. We are hoping that that time may never have to be reached. We shall have no stone unturned to avoid such a serious step. But we will not flinch when the moment has come and the need has arisen.”²

We are quite sure, that the final step cannot be avoided. But we are diffident about the native army. The greater part of it is supplied by the Gurkhas, the Punjabis and the Pathans. Except the Panchabees, there is not the slightest chance of the nationality movement reaching these races and affecting them to an extent, that they would lay down their arms at our orders. So our work of building the inner State must proceed without caring for the army. It can be done by the National Congress only. By the new constitution, even the smallest units of the country, the villages, will be directly affected by the Congress activity. The one crore members of the Congress must be men, who will not flinch when the moment comes. The Congress must evolve its own ministries of Education, Law, and Order. The Congress must become the sovereign power of the nation. Then the final command for suspension of payment of taxes will go forth ; and the true, earnest struggle shall begin. Men of real worth will be tested in that final phase. The Government will not shrink from terrorism, as it has not shrunk from it in Ireland. All the atrocities committed in Ireland will be repeated here. Large town-areas like Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, will be coerced into submission, by a very simple act, that of stopping the water-supply. . As for the peasantry and village-areas, they will be hunted

¹ Young India, March 30, 1921. ² Young India, March 9, 1921.

down with all the instruments of war easily available, 'since the Govt. is a strong military power. And moreover the peasantry is always scattered over a large area and therefore unable to do any concerted action. Village by village will be lashed to submission and obedience to the oppressors. Then where is our hope? We cannot expect that every man will have the courage single-handed to bear everything mutely and still be faithful to the Congress mandate, to the nation's command, when his house, his wife, his children shall be insulted, flogged and persecuted before his very eyes! After all we are human beings. Then? There is one remedy. The terrorism will be paralised by only one thing. And it lies in the hands of Indian labour. The army-movements in terrorism and their success will depend mainly upon the speedy transport of the soldiers from one centre to another, and of transport of foodstuffs and amunition for the army. All this is done by Indian labour. If at the extreme moment the Indian labour refuses to work in a solid mass, if the railwaymen, telegraph men, coolies and all sorts of labourers refuse to co-operate with the govt. *i. e.* arrange, what is called a *sabotage*, our success will be assured. The whole movement of govt. terrorism will be paralyzed and it will have to yield. The sepoy may not lay down his arms, terrorism of the govt. may become financially possible contrary to the expectations of Seely, schools and colleges may not be emptied and merchants may not stop the foreign trade; but when the final command to suspend paying taxes shall go forth, if the Indian labour will not flinch and do its duty. we will succeed. So side by side with the education of the peasantry must be done the work of organizing our labour and educating it. The labour organization and education is a more hopeful task; because the labourers always are found in large town-areas and in enormous units; a fermenting political atmosphere prevails in such large cities, which makes them susceptible to rapid changes, while the nature of their work makes them habituated to concerted action. This characteristic makes

us confident to say, that an organized Indian labour will not fail us at the time of action ; it is our dire necessity. If we win, we will win only by the help of the proletariat *i.e.* the labourers and peasantry. They are our main support. We care neither for the middle-class, nor for the corrupt intellectuals.

No one requires to be told that all this sabotage of the workers, our defence from terrorism by satyagraha, our building the inner State, until the outer crumbles down automatically is to proceed without any violence or disorder. Of course, when the huge mass of population of the Indian continent is to move for action, there is bound to be some violence and some disorder. But that would be nothing compared to those scenes, with which mankind has become familiar in history. We are sure this our so called violence will be nothing when considered by the side of Cromwell's execution of Charles I or the guillotine-rumbling of the Fr. Revolution. History cries out hoarsely to all these words. 'It is the nature of the Devil of tyranny to tear and rend the body, which he leaves.....If it were possible that a people brought under an intolerent and arbitrary system could subvert that system without acts of cruelty and folly, half the objections against despotic power would be removed.....We deplore the outrages that accompany revolutions. But the more violent the outrages, the more assured we feel that a revolution was necessary. The violence of those outrages will always be proportioned to the ferocity and ignorance of the people will be proportioned to the oppression and degradation under which they have been accustomed to live.....If our rulers suffered from popular ignorance, it was because they themselves had taken away the key of knowledge. If they were assailed with blind fury, it was because they had exacted an equally blind submission."¹ But after this was written, the methods of warfare have made much progress, and the method of non-violent opposition has come in vogue. We are sure, our later historians will not have an occasion to write in this strain about us !

¹ Macaulay 'Milton'. p. 40.

Some of our readers may charge us of being in a dream and writing of a dream, that we may have seen of the future of India. Some may say, "No use talking of the future. Do the work near at hand." To the former we will say that every ideal and every plan is a dream until it becomes a realized fact. Every plan of action to be done at the moment next to the one that is actually passing is speculation, dreaming. Thus every moment man is dreaming. We have only added together end to end many such moments, forming days and months at a stretch, and are dreaming about the plan for that much length of time. The greatest dreaming of a fabulous length of time and action is Idealism. To the latter we will say, "we must start work with a clear idea of what we will have to suffer and to what length and sphere, our activities may extend. It is no use starting the work nearest at hand and turn back half-way, when the terrors of the future are revealed with all their hideousness. We must calculate upon the worst first and with a clear idea of it, start on, which gives greater courage and greater enduring power."

! Only one point now and we finish. In Swaraj (really a dream to some) we will be faced with the problem of labour vs. capital and the agricultural problem. We must give preference of consideration to these problems first. For we shall win only with the help of the peasantry and labour, who will naturally expect an end of their miseries, after emancipation. The spinning wheel alone will not solve the labour problem of modern civilization. We cannot accept the communist plan, in all details, because it is too much fraught with coercion and violence. It must be accepted to this extent that great concerns like railways, mines and vast factory plants may be nationalized or controlled by the State, as even to-day they are being done in some countries. But how to prevent accumulation of capital in the hands of a few, through speculation and such other means? We may try the following remedy for this. We may fix upon a maximum amount of wealth that an individual may be allowed to possess. Let us take an

example of a family man of our day : A man, with a family of say at least four members requires a hundred and fifty rupees to live an honourable decent and happy life without any cares. Of course he is expected to have ambition, to provide something for his children, to have more luxuries of a happier life. The State must allow his powers of working out his ambition free play. But this ambition must be curtailed at some point. The State must stop him at a point, where he may be judged to have become "very luxurious" according to the standard of average life of luxuriousness. The standard will vary according to the notions of each man. But we think, in India, we may as well stop a man accumulating beyond one lac of rupees. When this maximum amount has been earned, the man may either stop his activity of earning or should devote the surplus to the State to be utilized for common good. This is only a suggestion. We have much time to think over its application and efficacy to solve the problem ; because we must only think until we get Swaraj !

The Second problem. It is well-known that the agricultural land of India in most parts is accumulated in the hands of great landlords or zamindars, who impoverish the peasants by high taxation and that the fruits of the peasant's honest toil goes to the idle, unproductive land-owners. The following figures will explain how the greatest part of agricultural land is divided into a few estates owned by capitalistic zemindars :—

Acres of land.		No. of estates in which the land is divided.	
25 million acres	...	90 estates	(of course one estate is an ownership of one zemindar.)
73	" ..	2000	"
187	" ...	½ million.	"
30	" ...	19 million.	"

So we can see that there are only 19 million peasants, who are independent peasant-proprietors, and to their poor lot falls

the bit or 30 million acres, *i. e.* a little more than one and a half acre for one peasant-proprietor. The remaining acreage is cultivated by farmers, who cannot be proprietors but are temporary tenants or lease-holders, whose real profit is swallowed by the zamindars and who can be turned out at their sweet will. The misery of the farmers can be solved only by breaking up the large estates into small holdings and turning them into peasant-proprietorships. Even in Europe the same policy is being followed. "The accepted policy in all the agricultural and thickly populated countries of Europe in the United Kingdom and elsewhere is the *break up of large estates and the promotion of small holding schemes*, by the State. It is by the break up of large estates and conversion of a landless, oppressed indebted and impoverished tenantry into a thrifty, free and flourishing class of peasant-proprietors, owning land in small and medium sized farms in conjunction with the organization of rural credit" that we can hold and keep agricultural India in peace and prosperity. Surely by these reforms we shall displease the zemindars and capitalists. But for some years to come we must face every unjust displeasure. In the end we will triumph, we will be free, we will make the oppressed people free, for ours is a cause of justice, of rights and of Religion. *With this we defy all.*

अस्तु.

APPENDIX A.

How Capitalism robs !

Two examples cited by Mr. C. F. Andrews.

One is that of a modern capitalist, who is said to have bought up all the bricks in the neighbourhood of one of the greatest cities in India, and then, having obtained the monopoly, to have raised immediately the price of building material by 200 per cent.

Let us look at a transaction like that squarely in the face. We know how, during the present housing crisis in Bombay and elsewhere, the one immediately necessary step to be taken is to create room for expansion in order to relieve the congested slum districts. Most vital moral issues depend on this being done quickly ; for immorality breeds in slums. Yet, in the very face of this urgent social demand, here is one individual, who can hinder the whole of that necessary building expansion and hold it up indefinitely by clever manipulation of the money market. Such a man is considered supremely lucky by his neighbours, if he succeeds in effecting his object. There appears to be nothing disgraceful in it. On the contrary, his new wealth brings him a thousand fresh admirers. But, if we read the parable of Christ aright, God is saying to him, all the while—

“Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee.”

Second : It has been recently reported to me, that a certain firm in Calcutta started business before the war and was only moderately successful. The shares had slowly risen from 100 to 145 and the rate of interest had slowly risen also. The price paid for the jute to the cultivator had also risen side by side with the prosperity of the jute business. At the outbreak of war, the cultivator could obtain 13 rupees 8 annas per maund for the jute. So far nothing abnormal had happened. But, during the war and after the war, the expenses of the jute cultivator had rapidly increased,

and therefore, in justice, he should have demanded more money in return for his labour. Indeed, in order to live at the same rate as before the war, he would need to spend at least twice as much money. He ought, therefore, to be getting not much less than thirty rupees per maund for his jute. But as a matter of fact the opposite of this has taken place. In the years 1914-1920 the jute shares in this company went up from 145 to 1160. The interest paid on the capital invested in the company went up from 15 per cent. before the war to 160 per cent. *But the price paid to the jute cultivator went down, from 13 rupees 8 annas before the war to six rupees in the year 1920!*

We have to understand that, here in India itself and all over the world, the destructive powers which can be wrought under the capitalistic system, when unrestricted, are so great, that, in their cumulative effects, they have far exceeded the violence of revolutionary mobs and predatory powers at open war with one another. The problem of the modern age is to curb these wild excesses of unrestricted capital, without destroying or weakening those forces of enterprise and initiative which are vitally necessary for progress.



APPENDIX B.

Some interesting figures.

Prices of Foodstuffs.

	In	In	In
Name of food	1857.	1890,	1918
(Fig. in seers per rupee)			
Wheat	39	25	5'5
Gram	51'5	28	7
Rice	18'5	12	4
Milk	160	64	4



APPENDIX C.

Export of living Animals from India.

Year	1901	1906	1911	1912	1916
Number	3,20,835	3,16,996	5,27,706	5,44,588	3,34,310
Value in £.	1,42,634	1,50,877	1,82,787	2,22,200	1,59,287

["In our life's struggle our cattle form our primary mainstay, Their milk constitutes our principal food from the day that we are born to the day that we die. It also forms our chief source of nutrition. The cattle forms practically our only beast of burden. It carries us from place to place and carries our merchandise too. Agriculture is wholly dependent on our cattle," Yet the Government pursues the policy of exporting them and of sending them to slaughter-houses. Advantages of British Government in India !!]
